REMARKS

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1 – 9 and 15 - 17 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 – 5 , 9, and 15 – 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang et al. (Patent No. US 6,556,724). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicants' exemplary claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the invention sets forth a method for configuring and dynamically adapting an application sharing system. The method comprises the step of determining a preference for a shared application, and monitoring by the one of the computers a feedback generated by the one of the system components, said feedback indicating the performance of the component relative to the determined preference. The method includes configuring the one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback, said configuring comprising adjusting an algorithm used to implement the system component, the configuring of the system component causing an adjustment in the performance of the shared application. Thus the Applicants clarify that when the system component is configured, the shared application itself is what is affected. Independent Claim 15 recites similar limitations. For an example of how system component configuration causes an adjustment in the performance of a shared application in accordance with the invention, see for example paragraph [00028] of the Applicants' specification. Here, a user has indicated a preference that all viewers received updates at the same rate and that native code be utilized on the hosting computer to increase performance. Thus the shared application will operate accordingly. Other examples can be found throughout the Applicants' specification.

Chang, in contrast, describes a classic client server application. Chang presents an image collaboration system wherein a host computer provides a source resolution independent image to client computers. (Chang Fig. 5, 320, Col. 9, lines 45 – 47.) Each client computers responds with calculated coefficient coordinates needed to render an image based on its client specific resolution. (Chang Fig. 5, 340, Col. 9 lines 50 - 54). The Host computer sends the requested coefficient coordinates to the clients (Chang Fig. 5 340, col. 9 53 - 55), which are used by each client individually to finish constructing its image. Note that the shared application itself, the source resolution independent image broadcasting application, has not been modified or adjusted in any way. Thus, Chang fails to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed method for configuring and dynamically adapting an application sharing system, including the step of "configuring the one of the system components in response to the determined preference and the monitored feedback, said configuring comprising adjusting an algorithm used to implement the system component, the configuring of the system component causing an adjustment in the performance of the shared application".

The Applicants therefore assert that Claims 1 – 5, 9, and 15 – 16 are not anticipated by Chang and are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 6 - 8 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Boston et al. (PGPUB: US 2004/0101272). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 – 8 depend on Claim 1. Claim 17 depends on Claim 15. Boston adds nothing further to solve the deficiencies of Chang as discussed above. Thus Chang and Boston, taken together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed invention as set forth in claims 1 – 9 and 15 – 17. The Applicants therefore respectfully assert that claims 1 – 9 and 15 – 17 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and arguments made herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicants' representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003, or at the undersigned's cell, (617) 901-6786.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 16, 2009
Reg. No.: 37,946

Fax No.: (508) 303-0005
Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003

/Mary M. Steubing/
Mary M. Steubing
Attorney for Applicants
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752